

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINARECEIVED
USDC CLERK, FLORENCE, SCThomas Reginald Brooks,
Plaintiff,VS.
The SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT.
OF CORRECTIONS, et al
LEE CORRECTIONAL INST.
at [redacted]**DENIED**Terry L. Wooten
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGEC/A NO. 4:11-cv-03362-TLW
2012 DEC -6 AM 8:15
RECEIVED - TLW
CLERK, FLORENCE S2012 AUG 13 A 10:54
MOTION TO NOTIFY THE EXHAUSTION OF AD-

MINISTRATIVE REMEDIES AND REQUEST TO

Proceed

[redacted] "in forma pauperis"

Defendants.

HEREIN THE Plaintiff Petitions upon the Court supported by the following
on or around date MAY 3rd 2012 at 10:15am the Plaintiff attempted to
notify the United States District Court of the ~~exhaustion~~ exhaustion
of administrative remedies which was the reason for the Mag. Judges
decision within The Honorable THOMAS S. RODGERS III, R&P, after
he recommended that the case be dismissed without prejudice and
without issuance and service of process which could cause a statute
of limitations issue if the plaintiff is not allowed to ~~proceed~~ proceed
after meeting the previous starens quo, for the delay that was just
and proper with all due respects to the Court.

HEREIN Relating to Complaint 4:11-cv-03362-TLW, that was
forwarded to the Clerk of Court on May 3rd 2012 at 10:15am con-
cerned the Plaintiff's attempt to address the Court of the Department
of Corrections last response within the following grievances, L.C.I.,
2372-11, L.C.I. # 2552-11, L.C.I. # 2294-11,
and L.C.I. # 0326-12. L.C.I. # 0326-12 has exceeded 70 days from
the step a date D.C.O.C. failed to respond as required under their
policy and therefore the Plaintiff has exhausted all admin. remedies
available to him as a matter of law Citing Boyd v. Corr. Corp. of
AM 380 F.3d 987, 996. The Plaintiff requests a issuance and
service of process and ~~the~~ wishes to be notified of this process to
introduce further pleadings. Note this legal matter at issue.
Respectfully,

For [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]
* 08-02-2012